

### **REMARKS**

Responsive to the Office Action dated May 5, 2004, Applicant has amended independent Claim 1. Claims 11-38 are hereby canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 are pending for consideration, with Claim 1 being independent.

#### **I. Summary of the Claims**

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites a solid electrolyte battery comprising a positive electrode, a negative electrode disposed opposite to the positive electrode, a separator disposed between the positive electrode and the negative electrode, and at least one solid electrolyte disposed between the positive electrode and the separator and between the separator and the negative electrode. The solid electrolyte comprises a mixture of a polymer and a swelling solvent present in a ratio of from about 1:5 to about 1:10. The separator comprises a polyolefin porous film having a thickness of from about 5  $\mu\text{m}$  to about 15  $\mu\text{m}$  and a volume porosity of from about 25% to about 60%. The impedance in the solid electrolyte battery is greater than the impedance realized at room temperature when the temperature of the solid electrolyte battery is from about 100°C to about 160°C. The solid electrolyte also has a thickness of from about 5  $\mu\text{m}$  to about 19  $\mu\text{m}$ .

#### **II. The § 103(a) Rejection**

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,716,421 to Pendalwar et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,322,923 to Spotnitz et al.. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not obvious under § 103(a) and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Pendalwar does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, Pendalwar does not teach or suggest a solid electrolyte battery wherein the solid electrolyte has a thickness of from about 5  $\mu\text{m}$ -19  $\mu\text{m}$ . Rather, Pendalwar merely teaches conventional gel electrolyte layer thicknesses of 75  $\mu\text{m}$  and 25  $\mu\text{m}$  thicknesses for separators used in liquid lithium ion cells. Similarly, while Spotnitz teaches a microporous polyolefin membrane having a thickness of 5-500  $\mu\text{m}$ , Spotnitz does not teach or suggest a solid electrolyte layer having a thickness of from about 5  $\mu\text{m}$ -19  $\mu\text{m}$ .

Prima facie obviousness requires that there must be a reasonable expectation of success when prior art is modified or combined. In the present application, there is no reasonable expectation of success in achieving the invention as claimed when the cited references are modified or combined. As discussed above, neither of the cited references teach or suggest *all* the elements of Applicant's independent claim. Unless all the elements are taught by the reference, there can be no success in modifying it

Thus, at the time the present invention was made, neither U.S. Patent No. 5,716,421 nor U.S. Patent No. 6,322,923 teach or describe *all* of the limitations claimed by Applicant in its

independent claim and the claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are nonobvious under § 103 (a).

### III. Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance and courteously solicits the same. If the Examiner should have any questions regarding the foregoing, she is encouraged to call the undersigned at 816.460.2516. Should any fees be necessitated by this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any such fees from Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By 

Lara Dickey Lewis, Reg. No. 48,161  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
816-460-2516 (telephone)  
816-531-7545 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT